REMARKS

To advance prosecution, Applicants have amended the claims. New independent claims 43, 51, 57, 58 and 59 are presented. The independent claims previously pending have been cancelled. No new matter has been added.

Applicants respectfully submit that each of the new independent claims distinguishes over the art of record. Therefore, the application is in condition for allowance.

Prior to discussing the claims individually, Applicants provide a brief summary of some embodiments disclosed in the present specification and the Nyman reference cited in rejecting all of the claims in the Final Office Action of July 11, 2008. This summary is not intended to characterize the claims or any of the terms used in the claims.

Briefly, the specification describes a peer-to-peer collaboration system in which each user may respond to events, such as messages from other users. The response may be based on an authentication level of the user initiating the event. The application describes at least three levels of authentication, including certified, authenticated or unauthenticated. A user may be certified, for example, by a network administrator. In contrast, a user may be authenticated for purposes of processing an event by a computing device based on input from a user of that computing device. Users that are not certified or authenticated may be regarded as unauthenticated.

The present application describes that even these unauthenticated users may be authenticated through a process of "implicit authentication" [14, 60]. Implicit authentication is implemented on a computing device by storing contact information for other users with which the user of the computing device has communicated. Subsequent communications from the same users may be treated as authenticated. This implicit authentication may be used in combination with warnings to the user of the computing device to block others from masquerading as authenticated users.

Specifically, in the peer-to-peer collaboration system, users have both an identity and a display name. While the identity may be unique, display names may be the same or very similar. As a result, a user may communicate unintentionally with an unauthenticated user, believing the unauthenticated user is in fact an intended authenticated user because they have the same or similar display names, which, for example, may create security problems.

Levels of authentication of users may also be used to reduce the likelihood of security problems in a peer-to-peer collaboration system. Warnings or restrictions on communication,

may be imposed based on authentication levels. The specific action of a computing device may be configured by a user of that device.

The Nyman reference cited in the Final Office Action does not describe such a system. In contrast, Nyman describes "name distribution messages" (see Abstract). As described in prior responses, the name distribution messages are generated by a user about themselves. When transmitted to devices of other users, the name distribution messages may be used for automatically resolving name conflicts [0022], i.e., without further user interaction.

Thus, there are multiply differences between the system described in the present application and the system of the Nyman reference. At least one of these differences is reflected in each of the independent claims.

For example, independent claim 43 relates to a method of operating a computing device. The claim recites "generating a warning on a display associated with the computing device." The Advisory Action mailed October 30, 2008 asserts that Nyman describes a warning. However, the Advisory Action cites to no feature of Nyman constituting such a warning. In the final rejection mailed July 11, 2008, ¶94 of Nynam was cited as teaching a warning. However, that passage describes encryption of user names, such that only authorized users can see the names of other users. Rather than relating to the display of information, that passage of Nyman describes the opposite. Accordingly, there is no basis for the assertion that Nyman teaches "generating a warning on a display." Accordingly, claim 43 should be allowed.

New claims 44-50 depend from claim 43 and should be allowed at least based on their dependency. Additionally, the dependent claims recite features that further distinguish over the reference.

Independent claim 51 also recites limitations that distinguish over Nyman. Claim 53 recites a system with at least three authentication levels, "a certified level, an authenticated level, and an unauthenticated level." The claim further recites a security policy with at least three options, including "allow," "restrict" and "warn." The claim further recites actions "in response to an event that triggers a function that includes display of a display name of a first user." The response depends on the authentication level and the security policy. Those options can include "presenting on a graphical user interface the display name of the first user in conjunction with performance of the function" or "presenting on a graphical user interface the display name of the first user in conjunction with the performance of the function…including presenting a warning

on the authentication level of the first user" and "omitting performance of the function."
Applicants respectfully submit that Nyman does not describe the combination of authentication
levels and security policy options recited in the claims or the recited actions in response to an
event depending on the authentication level and security policy. Accordingly, claim 51 should
be allowed.

Claims 52-56 depend from claim 51 and should be allowed at least based on their
dependency. The dependent claims also recite limitations that further distinguish over the
reference, providing additional reasons for allowance of the dependent claims.

Independent claim 57 also recites limitations that distinguish over Nyman. For example,
claim 57 recites "generating a warning on a display associated with the computing device." For
reasons that should be apparent from the discussion of the Nyman reference in conjunction with
claim 43 above, Nyman does not meet this limitation. Accordingly, claim 57 should be allowed.

New independent claim 58 also recites limitations that are not met by Nyman. For
example, claim 58 recites authentication levels, security policy options and specific actions taken
in response to an event based on the authentication level and security policy option. For reasons
that should be apparent from the discussion of Nyman above in connection with claim 51,
Nyman does not meet the limitations of new independent claim 58, and the claim should be
allowed.

New independent claim 59 also recites limitations that are not met by Nyman. For
example, claim 59 recites authentication levels, security policy options and specific actions taken
in response to an event based on the authentication level and security policy option. For reasons
that should be apparent from the discussion of Nyman above in connection with claim 51,
Nyman does not meet the limitations of new independent claim 59, and the claim should be
allowed.

Claims 60-65 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 59. These
claims should be allowed at least based on their dependencies. These claims recite limitations
that further distinguish the Nyman reference, providing additional reasons that the claims should
be allowed.

CONCLUSION

A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at the telephone number listed below if this communication does not place the case in condition for allowance.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, the Director is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment in the fees filed, asserted to be filed or which should have been filed herewith to our Deposit Account No. 23/2825, under Docket No. M1103.70263US00.

Dated: December 11, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By: Edmund J. Walsh
Registration No.: 32,950
Wolf, Greenfield & Sacks, P.C.
600 Atlantic Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2206
Telephone: (617) 646-8000

1549630.1